

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated June 27, 2005. Claims 1 to 16 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 11 to 13 and 15 have been amended, and Claims 1, 11 to 13 and 15 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 to 16 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1 to 18 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/309,884 ('884). In addition, Claims 1 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,923,756 (Shambroom) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,421,011 (Camillone), and Claims 1 to 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,602 (Northington) in view of Camillone.

Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns controlling access to a networked peripheral device by a user, wherein the networked peripheral device is accessible by the user based on centralized access management information. According to one feature of the present invention, a usage quota restricts a user's use of a feature and/or service provided by the networked peripheral device, wherein the usage quota is based on received access management information for the user.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 as amended is directed to a method for controlling access to a networked peripheral device by a user, wherein the networked peripheral device is accessible by the user based on centralized access management information. The method includes the step of receiving access management information for the user at the networked peripheral device from a centralized

location. The method also includes the step of determining, at the networked peripheral device, a feature and/or service provided by the networked peripheral device which the user can use and a usage quota which restricts the user's use of the feature and/or service, based on the received access management information. In addition, the method includes the step of allowing the user access to the networked peripheral device based on the determined feature and/or service and the determined usage quota corresponding to the feature and/or service.

In a similar manner, independent Claims 11 to 13 are respectively directed to a computer-readable memory medium, computer-executable program code and an apparatus.

Independent Claim 15 as amended is directed to a server for use in controlling access to a networked peripheral device by a user, wherein the networked peripheral device is accessible by the user based on centralized access management information. The server includes a processor executing processing steps of receiving a request for access management information, the request including authentication information, and authenticating the user using the authentication information. The processor also executes a processing step of transmitting access management information for the user indicating a feature and/or service provided by the networked peripheral device which the user can use and a usage quota which restricts the user's use of the feature and/or service, in a case that authentication of the user is successful.

Regarding the § 102 rejection, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention of the subject application. In particular, Shambroom, Northington and Camillone are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature that a

usage quota restricts a user's use of a feature and/or service provided by the networked peripheral device, wherein the usage quota is based on received access management information for the user.

As understood by Applicants, Shambroom discloses a system in which a server session key is used for validating a client at a destination server, so that the destination server can trust a command from the client. See Shambroom, column 9, lines 45 to 55. Northington, on the other hand, discloses that a web services element enables transmission of management and control commands between a system and a remote terminal. See Northington, column 3, line 62 to column 4, line 6. The Office Action acknowledges that Shambroom and Northington do not disclose that access management information for a user is associated with a quota. However, the Office Action cites to Camillone for this alleged disclosure.

As understood by Applicants, Camillone discloses a system in which access control is performed by a quota subsystem which permits or denies access to resources based upon assigned quotas. In a conventional UNIX disk quota subsystem there is a file per filesystem (called quota) which contains the disk quota for each user ID on the system, and contains the current allocation for each user. See Camillone, column 8, lines 50 to 65.

As such, the quota of Camillone is seen to correspond with an amount of disk space allocated to a user. This is different than the present invention, in which a usage quota restricts a user's use of a feature and/or service. Accordingly, Camillone is not seen to disclose or suggest that a usage quota restricts a user's use of a feature and/or service provided by the networked peripheral device, wherein the usage quota is based on received access management information for the user.

With reference to the provisional double patenting rejection, independent Claims 1, 11 to 13 and 15 as amended are believed to be non-obviously different from Claims 1 to 18 of the '884 application. In particular, Claims 1 to 18 of the '884 application are not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature that a usage quota restricts a user's use of a feature and/or service provided by the networked peripheral device, wherein the usage quota is based on received access management information for the user. Thus, independent Claims 1, 11 to 13 and 15 are believed to be allowable over Claims 1 to 18 of the '884 application.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 11 to 13 and 15 as amended are believed to be allowable.


The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Finally, an additional Information Disclosure Statement accompanies this Amendment.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to
our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,


John D. Magluyan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 100879v1